



Thessaloniki, 23/09/2011
RS/PRO/YSIRAK/2011/0737

INVITATION TO TENDER **AO/RES/SAK/Servers-Storage/016/11**

“Acquisition of Servers and Storage & provision of ancillary services”

CLARIFICATION (1) – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Dear Madam/Sir,

In regards to the above mentioned Open Tender Procedure please find below the answers of Cedefop to the clarification questions, raised by one potential tenderer.

Question 1:

Table **T.2.4.1 Racks** - page 13, requirement “Size= 40U”. We request to be changed to 42U since the requirement for a 40U rack excludes some rack manufacturers.

Cedefop Answer to Question 1

The 40U size is a minimum requirement; therefore the 42U size of rack is acceptable.

Question 2:

Table **T.2.4.2 Blade Enclosure** - page 14, requirement “Number of supported blade servers (half-size) = 16”. We request this requirement to be changed to 14, at least full height, since the requirement excludes most manufacturers. Also please clarify if more than one Blade Enclosures can be offered in case more than 14 blade servers are needed?

Cedefop Answer to Question 2

The number of supported blade servers (any-size) is hereby changed to 14.

Question 3:

Table **T.2.4.2 Blade Enclosure** - page 14, requirement “Number of power supplies = 6”. We request to be changed to at least 4 or the maximum number of power supplies that can be supported of the offered Blade Enclosure.

Cedefop Answer to Question 3

The required number of power supplies is hereby changed to at least 4.

Question 4:

Table **T.2.4.3 High Performance Blade Server** - page 15, requirement “RAM upgradeable to (without the removal of the installed default RAM) = 512 GB”, we request to be changed

to at least 256 GB or to be clarified if this requirement can be covered with the addition of a memory expansion module or with the transformation to the offered blade server to a 4 socket system.

Cedefop Answer to Question 4

The RAM should be upgradeable to 512 GB, since this is a specification for a high performance server destined for virtualisation.

A solution with additional expansion module is acceptable provided that this does not alter any other specification.

The minimum requirement is for two-socket system. A technical solution with four-socket system, that covers the memory specifications/ requirements, is acceptable.

Question 5:

Table **T.2.4.3 High Performance Blade Server** - page 15, requirement “*RAID Controller for O.S. HDDs*” and requirement “*Controller Cache for better performance*”, we request to be changed to optional due to the fact that SSD hard disks will be offered which have 3 times more credibility than the SAS disks so the RAID support is not necessary.

Cedefop Answer to Question 5

SSD hard disk performance can be offered as an alternative to controller cache, but the criticality of the Operating System requires mandatory redundancy that only a RAID system provides. Therefore the requirement for RAID support remains.

Question 6:

Table **T.2.4.3 High Performance Blade Server** - page 15, requirement “*4 x 10G Ethernet ports*” and requirement “*Available I/O slots for additional mezzanines = 2*”, we request to be clarified if this requirements can be covered with the addition of an I/O expansion module in each server.

Cedefop Answer to Question 6

Such technical solution could be accepted provided that the additional expansion module does not alter any other element of the specification.

Question 7:

Table **T.2.4.4 High Performance Blade Server** - page 16, requirement “*2 x 10G Ethernet ports*” and requirement “*Available I/O slots for additional mezzanines = 2*”, we request to be clarified if this requirements can be covered with the addition of an I/O expansion module in each server.

Cedefop Answer to Question 7

Such technical solution could be accepted provided that the additional expansion module does not alter any other element of the specification.

Question 8:

Table **T.2.4.6b Interconnectivity Components – Blade Interconnect - Ethernet** - page 18, requirement “*Number of 10G downlinks to Blade Servers = 16*”, we request to be changed to 14 since the requirement excludes some manufacturers.

Cedefop Answer to Question 8

The number of the 10G downlinks follows the number of servers supported by the blade enclosure (so it is now 14, in line with the Answer to Question 2).

Question 9:

Table **T.2.4.6c Interconnectivity Components – Blade Interconnect - Fibre Channel** - page 18, requirement “*Number of 8G downlinks to Blade Servers = 16*”, we request to be changed to 14 since the requirement excludes some manufacturers.

Cedefop Answer to Question 9

The number of the 8G downlinks follows the number of servers supported by the blade enclosure (so it is now 14, in line with the Answer to Question 2).
